Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 10 County District No 057816 A W BROWN-FELLOWSHIP LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	#NA	#NA
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	#NA	#NA
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	#NA	#NA
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	U U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 71%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.076				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 10 County District No 057816 A W BROWN-FELLOWSHIP LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C. 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

10 057829

A+ ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	86%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	54%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	Ũ	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	54%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 55%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are r	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3370		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

A+ ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

 Region
 10

 strict No
 05782

Region County District No 109901

ABBOTT ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	66%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 74%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary				,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	68%	NO	inioniougo una onno	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

District

ABBOTT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>12</u> strict No **109901** 

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

17 095901

ABERNATHY ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	94%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	86%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor t required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		osmall
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 63%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 62%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs						demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

.

District

Region	1/
County District No	0959

ABERNATHY ISD	AB	ERN	ΑΤΗΥ	ISD	
---------------	----	-----	------	-----	--

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District ABILENE ISD

LEA State State LEA Met State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators** Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 86% 68% 67% NO 52% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 7% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 20% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO NO 1% 1% YES YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 1% objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year maiority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved. numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YES skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 59% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 55% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv IEPs of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers. district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 22190

	A	BIL	.EN	E IS	SD
--	---	-----	-----	------	----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

014901

District

ACADEMY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	-	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	63%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	63%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	S with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 01490

ACADEMY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No	10181

District ACADEMY OF ACCELERATED LEARNING INC

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 83%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

 Region
 04

 strict No
 101810

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 101810

District ACADEMY OF ACCELERATED LEARNING INC

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 015816

ACADEMY OF CAREERS AND TECHNOLOGIE District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	75%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	84%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	25%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.			•		•	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	0001	00.00/	V/50		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	#NA	#NA	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	#NA	#NA		Statement 2	5176	50.778	110		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.5 %	NO		123	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No 015816

Region

District ACADEMY OF CAREERS AND TECHNOLOGIE

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

057810

District

ACADEMY OF DALLAS

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	27%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1			_		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 30%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than			NO			7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPo who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	ES with IEPS who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

ACADEMY OF DALLAS

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 10 strict No 057810

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 101849

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

ACCELERATED INTERMEDIATE ACADEMY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	56%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 44%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 73%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with JEPo who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 101849

District ACCELERATED INTERMEDIATE ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 16 County District No 180903

ADRIAN ISD

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	92%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*			1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	g with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES				Targets no	t required fo	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statemen		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.3%				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 18090

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

AD'	VAN	TAGE	ACAD	EMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	ar early iving the and related childhood			Baseline Data Reporting Year Irgets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			5	·				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	73%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	00.0%	TES		o small district level		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO		Statement 2							
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UVI			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported		

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 057806

ADVANTAGE ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region County District No

02 178901

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

AGUA DULCE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	53%	NO			
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES			
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES			
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading		ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate sc residential facility.									
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /6	00.0 %	1123		o small district level			
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 64%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 81% 82.7		82.7%	YES		o small				
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported			
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported			

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 17890

AGUA DULCE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

20 015901

ALAMO HEIGHTS ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	48%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early.</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	4%	NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 97%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 78%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 65%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

Region

ALAMO HEIGHTS ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

07 250906

ALBA-GOLDEN ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	54%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	11%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular parts</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	YES 9% N	
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	62%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 62%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		0.5%				<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No ALBA-GOLDEN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 07 25090

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 20

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

ALBANY ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	83%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	ar early iving the and related		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			rargets ne		2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	78%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	Statement					o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 74%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

ALBANY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>14</u>

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 101902

ALDINE ISD

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	63%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	76%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	25%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES		Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	Reading NO		Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0% 0.5% NC	NO		YES	children aged 3 through 5 s	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
	0 /0			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported			
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 101902

ALDINE ISD
------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA LEA Rate State Target?	
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 11 County District No 184907

ALEDO ISD

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

LEA State State LEA Met State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators** Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 83% 68% 67% NO 71% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 3% 10% 13% NO 10% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO \* 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year maiority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved. numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YES skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 85% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 72% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv IEPs of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers. district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 18490

ALEDO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ AnnualStateStatePerformance Report IndicatorsTargetRate			State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	ncludes appropriate measurable pals that are annually updated an age appropriate transition sition services, including courses reasonably enable the student to econdary goals, and annual IEP		NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 125901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

ALICE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	68%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	85%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	30%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 52%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 51%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No 12590

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

ALICE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region04County District No101903

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

ALIEF ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	48%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	16%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	24%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoof facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 59%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.5 /6	NO		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 101903

ALIEF	ISD
-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) Region 04 County District No 101815

District ALIEF MONTESSORI COMMUNITY SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators           5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			. 20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 101815

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District ALIEF MONTESSORI COMMUNITY SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 10 County District No

043901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

ALLEN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	2%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 87%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 79%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.570	NO		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 04390

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

057832

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Δ1	РНΔ	CHARTER	SCHOOL
ᇧᄂ			SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	57%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	90%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	29%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
			_		_	education class, separate sc residential facility.	hool or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	000/	00.00/			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	31%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	38%	NO	_	Statement 2	5776	56.7 /0	123		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.576	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

District

ALPHA CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

 Region
 10

 strict No
 05783

Region 18 County District No 022901

ALPINE ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	91%	YES	<ul> <li>5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</li> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21 served inside the regular class less</li> </ul>		68%	67%	NO	69%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*		ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	lar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	570/	50.70/	¥50	· · · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	57%	NO	nino nio ago ana onino	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 02290

ALPINE ISD		٩L	PI	NI	ΕI	SD
------------	--	----	----	----	----	----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 037901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

ALTO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<ul> <li>5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</li> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less</li> </ul>		68%	67%	NO	43%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 45%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 41%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070			123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 03790

ALTO IS	SD
---------	----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

126901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

ALVARADO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	78%	YES	<ul> <li>5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</li> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less</li> </ul>		68%	67%	NO	92%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	11%	NO			10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 12690

AL	_VA	RA	DO	ISD
----	-----	----	----	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 020901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

ALVIN ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	<ul> <li>5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</li> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			rargets no	it required to	1 FF1 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved						o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Region

County District No 02090

ALVIN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	Met LEA Met State Performance Plan/ A		State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

State

Target

75%

State

Rate

77%

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

State

Met

Target?

YES

Region County District No

ALVORD ISD

11 249901

District

LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES			
0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES			
	*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with I 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ls, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES			
Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and receir majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate scl residential facility.			Data Report	0					
Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level			

2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6</li> <li>21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	-	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 71%	Reading NO	<b>7B</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	61%	NO		Statement 2	57%	56.7%	TE3		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	NO		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 24990

AL	.vo	RD I	SD
~ ~ L		וטו	<b>JD</b>

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

16 188901

AMARILLO ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 63%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UPD who	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.5 /6	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

AMARILLO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 16 18890

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 04 County District No 084804

AMBASSADORS PREPARATORY ACADEMY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	e State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1% YES		#NA	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES					e Data Repor	U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.       7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who   Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 45%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 084804

District AMBASSADORS PREPARATORY ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 13 County District No 227801

AMERICAN YOUTHWORKS CHARTER SCHOOL District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	83%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1% 1% YES			YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						education class, separate sc residential facility.	hool or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	0%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	163		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UPD who	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 22780

District AMERICAN YOUTHWORKS CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

140901

AMHERST ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	50%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	85%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	50%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1% YES 4%			NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				Data Repor	0	
	95% 99% YES 100% YES services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		pecial		l argets no	ot required fo	r FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	56%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	163		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	38%	NO		Statement 2	07.70	00.770	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to smal numbers, district	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

District

AMHERST ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

 Region
 17

 strict No
 14090

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

101819 AMIGOS POR VIDA-FRIENDS FOR LIFE PUB CHTR District SCH

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	e State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	79%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1% YES		0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				e Data Repor	0	
						residential facility.			1	I	1	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	100%	YES		Statement 2	5170	30.776	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	NU		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 04 County District No 101819 AMIGOS POR VIDA-FRIENDS FOR LIFE PUB CHTR SCH

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher		NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C. 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No **0** 

04 036901

n Indicator Targets I 1-12) District

ANAHUAC ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	94%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES			
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO			
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	4%	NO			
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			•	eporting Year d for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level			
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 62%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small			
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	UNU		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported			
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported			

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 03690

ANAHUAC ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

093901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

ANDERSON-SHIRO CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	87%	YES			
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES			
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES			
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				•	ata Reporting Year equired for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report				
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level			
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported			
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level			
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported			
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported			

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No	)(

Region

ANDERSON-SHIRO	CISD
----------------	------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

ANDREWS ISD

18 002901

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?				
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	69%	YES				
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO				
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES				
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece, majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.			•	Data Reporting Year required for FFY 2011						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small					
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported				
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level				
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 58%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported				
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level				
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported				
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported				

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

ANDREWS	ISD
---------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 0

ANGLETON ISD

04 020902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	70%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	3%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	90%	99%	TES	100%	TES	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due t	o small
	87%	63%	NO	65%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers,	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 65%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County	District	No	

Region

ANGLETON ISD
--------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs       100%       99.3%       NO			YES		
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

ANNA ISD

10 043902

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	49%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			ting Year r FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	/ES numbers, dist	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region County District No

ANNA ISD

043902

District

	r	r	T	1	T		-				T
State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs       100%       99.3%       NO		NO		YES	
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 127901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

ANSON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	80%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	89%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Ye Targets not required for FFY 3			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 53%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement		57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.5 /6	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	data ara		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs100%99.3%NO			YES		
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_

ANTHONY ISD

19 071906

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	43%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	83%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	14%	NO	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.		l argets no	t required for	r FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 69%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	E <b>7</b> 0/	50 70/	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	62%	NO	5	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	TES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.570				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 071906

A	NT	HOI	NY	ISD
---	----	-----	----	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs       100%       99.3%       NO			YES		
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 17 County District No 110901

ANTON ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual e Performance Report Indicators et?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	77%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1% 1% YES		YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 58%	Reading NO	<b>7B</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 58%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%				5 demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 11090

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

06 228905

APPLE SPRINGS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1% YES		0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood			Baseline Data Reporting Year			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	92%	NO	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	, -	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	58%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.076	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
A. Demand of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	45%	NO	<b>70</b> : Demonstration	Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	UVI					72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**APPLE SPRINGS ISD** 

District

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary	71%	69%	NO	number	o small s, district

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C. 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 06 228905

level data are not

reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 109912

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

AQUILLA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators t?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	96%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 2 through 5.</li> </ul>		1% 1% YE		YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			0	
						residential facility.			I	1	I	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	47%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	00.0%	TES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 27%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 10991

AQUIL	LA ISD
-------	--------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

02 004901

_	
ARANSAS COUNTY ISD	
ANANGAG COUNT 1 150	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	69%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	84%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	23%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Demonst of children or of 2 through 5.</li> </ul>		1% 1% YES		YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 53%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UV					72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No ARANSAS COUNTY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 02

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region \_\_\_\_\_

205901

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District

ARANSAS PASS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Demont of children aged 2 through 5</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	lot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 48%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 42%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level not reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

**ARANSAS PASS ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 02 20590

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

09 005901

ARCHER CITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related special education and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	75%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0076	00.0%	TES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	58%	NO		Statement 2	07.70	00.1 /0	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

ARCHER CITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region ng 00590

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 061910

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

ARGYLE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	71%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 94%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 92%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 061910

ARGYI	LE ISD
-------	--------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

ARISTOI CLASSICAL ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA		<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		67%	NO	96%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	U U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 73%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 64%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.070	110		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 10180

ARISTOI CLASSICAL ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

220802

ARLINGTON CLASSICS ACADEMY District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	91%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 82%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 91%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	/ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 22080

ARLINGTON CLASSICS ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

State

Target

0%

0.7%

NO

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

**4B:** Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

State Performance Plan/ Annual

**Performance Report Indicators** 

LEA

Met

State

Target?

YES

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

LEA

Rate

11 220901

LEA Met

State

Target?

Due to small

numbers. district level

data are not reported

District

State

Target

76%

77%

YES

			Ŭ		Target?					U		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	67%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	-	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		Targets no	ot required fo	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 65%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small
			-			demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 59%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	uata are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NU		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

#### **ARLINGTON ISD**

State

Met

Target?

State

Rate

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No	

Region

ARL	ING	INO1	חפו	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 212901 County District No

ARP ISD

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

LEA State State LEA Met State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators** Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 91% 68% 67% NO 72% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 8% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO \* 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year maiority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved. numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YES skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 81% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 81% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv IEPs of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers. district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Region County District No 21290

ARP ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

06 021805

ARROW ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	53%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	29%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece. majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070	NO		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No ARROW ACADEMY

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

ASPERMONT ISD

14 217901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	89%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	21, served in separate school	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early	ar early iving the and related childhood	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading	Reading NO	Reading 58%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1			Due to	o small	
						demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 75%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		0.5%				<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 21790

Region

ASPERMONT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 107901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

ATHENS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	76%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or						
						residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · · ·	lot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	62%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 %	00.0 %	1123		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 59%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		iot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				59%		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 10790

ATHENS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No 03

08 034901

District

ATLANTA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	82%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	18%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 51%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 51%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UVI		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

ATLANTA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

08

Region

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_\_

AUBREY ISD

<u>11</u> 061907

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	80%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si	lar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	80%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers,	o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 73%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 06190

AUBREY	ISD
--------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 227818

AUSTIN CAN ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	50%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	35%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 80%	Reading NO	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	78%	NO	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 25%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.076			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		NO	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 22781

District AUSTIN CAN ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

**4B:** Percent of districts that have a

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

0%

0.7%

NO

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

LEA

Region County District No

AUSTIN DISCOVERY SCHOOL

13 227821

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

District

76%

77%

YES

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recent majority of special education services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		rargets no	t required fo	FF 1 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	76%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	82%	NO		Statement 2	0170	00.170	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported

YES

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

AUSTIN DISCOVERY SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 227901

AUSTIN ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	61%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	60%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	19%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	-	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			raigete ne	a roquirou ro	2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	, -	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	54%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		·
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region \_\_\_\_\_

Α	US	TIN	IS	D

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		NO
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

03 196901

AUSTWELL-TIVOLI ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	83%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	TES	100%	TES	education class, separate so residential facility.	education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who			81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	163		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	50%	NO		Statement 2	5170	30.770	120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool       Summary         children aged 3 through 5       Statement 1         with IEPs who       demonstrate improved use         of appropriate behaviors to       Summary         Statement 2       Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070						72%	73.1%	YES		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No AUSTWELL-TIVOLI ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 03

IEPs by race and ethnicity

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

Region County District No

AVALON ISD

070901

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	48%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related		Baseline Data Reporting Year				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	43%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	TES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	52%	NO		Statement 2	5776	30.7 /8	123		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for childron with dischilding		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

for children with disabilities

10

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

**AVALON ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 10 07090

Region 80 County District No 194902

AVERY ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	86%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	44%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	14%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</li> <li>7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.</li> </ul>		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 74%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of	Gummanu				· · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	74%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 194902

AVERY	ISD
-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, distri level data are r reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_

08 034902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	56%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	6%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 50%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool       Summary         children aged 3 through 5       Statement 1         with IEPs who       settement 1         demonstrate improved use       Summary         of appropriate behaviors to       Summary         meet their needs       Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UN		163			72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 034902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region12County District No161918

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

AXTELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	29%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	53%	NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<ul> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</li> <li>7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who</li> </ul>				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	41%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 37%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEC	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES			72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 161918

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region11County District No220915

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

AZLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	81%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related		ted Baseline Data Reporting			0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Targets no	t required for	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due tr	o small
	87%	63%	NO	65%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 61%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.5%	NO		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Region County District No 2209

AZLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 07 County District No 212803

ooung

District A

AZLEWAY CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	64%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	80%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	36%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 20%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 13%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 21280

**AZLEWAY CHARTER SCHOOL** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 030903

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BAIRD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<ul> <li>5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</li> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		68%	67%	NO	89%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 62%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 62%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summary		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
IEPs						of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 03090

BAIRD	ISD
-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

15 200901

District

BALLINGER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 48%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.076				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

BALL	INGER	ISD
------	-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>15</u> 200901

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

**BALMORHEA ISD** 

18 195902

,

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	90%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 43%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 195902

BAI	MO	RHEA	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_0

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

BANDERA ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 65%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.5 %	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 0

BANDERA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<ul> <li>13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs</li> </ul>		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 20

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

15 025901

BANGS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	87%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	74%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	80%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 62%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				02 /6		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 02590

BANGS	ISD
-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

02 178913

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

BANQUETE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sci	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	TES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 53%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	, -	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

**BANQUETE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 17891

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

04 036902

BARBERS HILL ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	92%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recel majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	U	
						residential facility.			I	1	I	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	86%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	88%	YES	7C: Percent of preschool	Summary					
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **BARBERS HILL ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 04 03690

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

13 014902

District

BARTLETT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	74%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 29%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 38%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

BARTLETT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

13 011901

BASTROP ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	66%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	59%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education	lar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	Ũ	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		Targets no	t required fo	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	55%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	55%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%			VEO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 01190

**BASTROP ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

101809

District

BAY AREA CHARTER INC	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	57%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	98%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	29%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						residential facility.			1	1		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	61%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		not reported
	83%	59%	NO	44%	NO		Statement 2	0170				
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **BAY AREA CHARTER INC** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 04 101809

Region County District No 158901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BAY CITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 58%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.576			115	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	/ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 15890

**BAY CITY ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) Dis

Region	04
County District No	101847

District BEATRICE MAYES INSTITUTE CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 97%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 39%	Reading NO	<b>7B</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 39%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 101847

District BEATRICE MAYES INSTITUTE CHARTER SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

05 123910

.

REA	ONT	חפו

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annual te Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	63%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	27%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 99%	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				Data Repor	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.			•			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	56%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	TES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 55%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

District

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

\_\_\_\_

District

County District No \_

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		NO
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **BECKVILLE ISD** 

LEA State State LEA Met State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators** Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 71% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 16% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO \* 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year maiority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved. numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YES skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 82% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 64% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv IEPs of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers. district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **BECKVILLE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

013901

District

**BEEVILLE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	3%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 53%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			0	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 01390

BEEVIL	LE ISD
--------	--------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

09 039904

**BELLEVUE ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	69%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					· · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	57%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	uala ale li	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	UNU			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 039904

**BELLEVUE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 091901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BELLS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 55%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0				0	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 09190

BELLS	ISD
-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

06 008901

BELLVILLE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	96%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of	Baseline Data Reporting Year						
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 71%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	YES numbers, disi		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	61%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool							
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool Sun children aged 3 through 5 State with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5 %	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region12County District No014903

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BELTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	1%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	TES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%				<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 01490

**BELTON ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_\_

02 125902

District E

BEN BOLT-PALITO BLANCO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	93%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	11%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	65%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80 %	00.070	113		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 63%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				0378		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 12590

**BEN BOLT-PALITO BLANCO ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

02 066901

District

BENAVIDES	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 45%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 45%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 06690

**BENAVIDES ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No 13

09

BENJAMIN ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece, majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Moth Moth Moth Moth Moth Summ	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	ol year for children with demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to Summ	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported					
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 138904

в	ΕN	JA	M	N	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

Region County District No 015809

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BEXAR	COUNTY	ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 64%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	of appropriate behaviors to Su	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported						
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 015809

**BEXAR COUNTY ACADEMY** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

06 187901

**BIG SANDY ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math Math Math Math Math Math Math The subscription of the subscri	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2% YES			Due to small numbers, district level					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	73%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	62%	NO		Glatement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0% 0.5% NO YES		demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

**BIG SANDY ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

06 18790

Region

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

07 230901

**BIG SANDY ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	83%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1% 1% YES		YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			Targets not required for FFY 201			r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 51%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	570/	50 70/	¥50	· · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	56%	NO	·····	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

**BIG SANDY ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	e State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to smal	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, distri level data are n reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 23090

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

18 114901

District

**BIG SPRING ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	91%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5</li> </ul>		1% 1%		YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 46%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 43%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district levents</li> <li>data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	S <b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.076						72%	73.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

BIG	SPR	ING	ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, distric level data are no reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 20 County District No 193801

County District N

BIG SPRINGS CHARTER SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	86%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	99%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	14%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5.</li> </ul>		1% 1% YI		YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	U	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			Targets not required for FFY 2011			r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	15%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	83%	59%	NO	7%	NO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
Suspensions and explasions of greater trian 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 19380

**BIG SPRINGS CHARTER SCHOOL** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

**BIRDVILLE ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	75%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	63%	NO		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO		
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1% 1% YES		0%	YES		
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for       Baseline Data Report					0	
	5570	5576	120	5576	120									
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small		
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	66%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 59%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3370		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>			
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

	.,			_
BIRD\	/ILL	E IS	D	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	Indary school, had IEPs in effect at the time left school, and were enrolled in higher sation or competitively employed within one 56% 57% YES		number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 17

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

BISHOP CISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	33%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	33%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Targets not required for FFY 201			r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 68%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO		Statement 2	5176	56.7 /6	1123		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			. 20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 178902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

14 177903

District

BLACKWELL CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	50%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	90%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early ving the and related childhood becial			Data Repor	U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 91%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 45%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district let data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	576	0.070			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Distric

County District No

Region

ct	BLACKWELL CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

13 016902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**BLANCO ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	80%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	86%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	20%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 70%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 58%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2 72% 73.1% YES		numbers, district level data are not reported					
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 016902

BLANCO	ISD
--------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 116915

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BLAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	50%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Rep Targets not required			0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 63%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 61%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.5 /0			123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 116915

BLAND	ISD
-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

15 025904

**BLANKET ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	16%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				e Data Repor	0		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		Targets no	ot required for	or FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 71%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	<b>57</b> 0/	50.70/	VEO		district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO		Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES			
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

Region

BLANKET ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

15

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 80

**BLOOMBURG ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	82%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				Data Repor	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.			1	1	1	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	55%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	50%	NO		Statement 2	0770	00.170	120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **BLOOMBURG ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

**BLOOMING GROVE ISD** 

12 175902

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	49%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Duri	
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	73%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 69%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2 72% 73.1%		YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>			
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

**BLOOMING GROVE ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>12</u>

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

03 235901

**BLOOMINGTON ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	57%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	43%	NO	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	44%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /8	00.078	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 40%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		0.5%	NG			7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No	-
BLOOMINGTON ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 03

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

043917

District

BLUE RIDGE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp oducation class separate sp		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						education class, separate school or residential facility.			1	T	1	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve data are not reported	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	0.000	00.00/			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	48%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	43%	NO		Statement 2	5776	50.7 /0	123		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needsSummary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.070			123			72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 04391

BLUE	RIDGE	ISD
------	-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No C

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District

BLUFF DALE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<i>5C:</i> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	67%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of	83%	59%	NO	67%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>11</u>

Region County District No 109913

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**BLUM ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	77%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece, majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 48%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UNU		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 10991

**BLUM ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

05 123807

nce on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District

BOB HOPE SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	48%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	52%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class separate sp	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.			1	1	1	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not repor</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	90.99/	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	62%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 31%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				5170		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No BOB HOPE SCHOOL

Distric	L	60		
				r –
Plan/ Annual	State	State	State Met	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 05

Region County District No

BOERNE ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	94%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	69%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	78%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 77%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 13090

BO	ERNE	חפו
- 60	ENNE	130

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 116916

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BOLES ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	66%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070			123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 116916

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 241901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**BOLING ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	84%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 97%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 53%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070			123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 24190

BOLING	ISD
--------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BONHAM ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	84%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	53%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 55%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 48%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 074903

BONHAM	ISD
--------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 148901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BOOKER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	75%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate so education class, separate so	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, o	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 63%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 44%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 1 Summary	81%	82.7%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported
IEPs						of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 14890

**BOOKER ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

017901

District

BORDEN COUNTY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	89%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	lar early iving the and related childhood		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate sc residential facility.							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 33%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				0070		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

District

017901

BORDEN	COUNTY ISD
--------	------------

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 117901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BORGER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	87%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recel majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.576	NO		110	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 11790

BORGER ISD
------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

State

Target

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

Region County District No

**BOSQUEVILLE ISD** 

12 161923

District

State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	59%	NO
11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES
21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recein majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sy education class, separate sy	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report t required for	0	
				residential facility.						
Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small listrict level
				positive social-emotional	Summon					ot reported

					Turget.							
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	59%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate school or education class, separate school or residential facility.			FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%				small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 61%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are no	listrict level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **BOSQUEVILLE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary	71%	69%	NO	number	o small s, district

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

12 16192

level data are not

reported

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 185901

**BOVINA ISD** 

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	85%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	4%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related		Baseline Data Reporting Year				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc residential facility.		Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading	Reading NO	Reading	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small
						demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	uata are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.5%				<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 18590

BOVINA I	SD
----------	----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 169901 County District No

**BOWIE ISD** 

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

LEA State State LEA Met State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators** Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 92% 68% 67% NO 72% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less YES 10% 11% NO 8% 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year maiority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 98% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved. numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YES skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 59% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of data are not reported Math Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 48% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv IEPs of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers. district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 169901

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are no reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 249902

County District No

BOYD ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	92%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	70%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</li> <li>7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.</li> </ul>		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	39%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	6670	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	33%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Summary Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070						72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 24990

**BOYD ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

16 180901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**BOYS RANCH ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	60%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	40%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.       7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who     Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	Due to		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 40%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 44%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			125	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**BOYS RANCH ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 16 County District No 18090

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_1

20 136901

BRACKETT ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*			1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Targets no		1112011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	55%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	47%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool	Summony					
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	children aged 3 through 5 statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 13690

Region

BRACKETT ISE	כ
--------------	---

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 160901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BRADY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	94%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	66%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO					1%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES					e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due t	o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 44%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 45%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.3%			163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	not reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level not reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 16090

BRADY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 00

06 008903

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BRAZOS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 95%	Reading	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	95%	99%	TES	95%	TES							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	95%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	67%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	163		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPo who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to smal	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	S with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 008903

**BRAZOS ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 213801

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

BRAZOS RIVER CHARTER SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	95%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	5%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1% 1%		YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	23%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 17%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with UEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NU		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 21380

BRAZOS RIVER CHARTER SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District County District No 02

Region

BRAZOS SCHOOL FOR INQUIRY & CREATI

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.       7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who     Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 39%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.076	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 021803

District **BRAZOS SCHOOL FOR INQUIRY & CREATI** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

04 020905

BRAZOSPORT ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
<b>1</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	81%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	63%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting Year							
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	ES Due to sma		
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 66%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	570/	50 70/		· · ·	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	56%	NO		Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES			
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.378	NO		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 02090

Region

BRAZOSPORT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to numbers level data repo	s, district a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

215901

District

BRECKENRIDGE ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	91%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	53%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES Due to s		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 66%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 72%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			125	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 2

Region

BRE	CKENR	IDGE	ISD
-----	-------	------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary       71%       69%       NC         education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.       71%       69%       NC		NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

06 198901

BREMOND ISD

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	80%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	76%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	20%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and relatedBaseline Data Reporting Year						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported		
(A) Demonstration for the three second	83%	59%	NO	54%	NO	<b>70</b> : Demonst of announced								
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO	1	YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.5 %	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported		
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

Region

BREMOND ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

06

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

06 239901

**BRENHAM ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	75%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	90.99/	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	55%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				0270		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

BRENHAM	ISD
---------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_1

05 181901

District

BRIDGE CITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece. majority of special education services in the regular early	lar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate spectrum education class, separate so residential facility.			Targoto ne	a roquirou ro	2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	74%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.076	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 75%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				73%		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

\_\_\_\_

District

<u>05</u> 18190<sup>-</sup>

Region

BRIDGE CITY ISD	B	RID	GE	СІТ	Y	ISD
-----------------	---	-----	----	-----	---	-----

County District No

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

11 249903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BRIDGEPORT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	78%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	19%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recel majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	Ũ	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 53%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.076	NO		TEG	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No	
--------------------	--

**BRIDGEPORT ISD** 

Region

11 249903

reported

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level data	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program: or competitively	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

education or training program; or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C. 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

243801

District

**BRIGHT IDEAS CHARTER** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 50%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 33%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs						demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 24380

**BRIGHT IDEAS CHARTER** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

Region County District No

07 203902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BROADDUS ISD
--------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	85%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				e Data Repor	0	
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	50%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /8	00.078	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and upo of		57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 203902

- RD	ΩΛΓ	פווחו	SISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual State State State Met Target Rate Target?			LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 184909

BROCK ISD

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood		Baseline Data Reporting Year					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			l argets no	ot required to	or FFY 2011		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 89%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	==0(	50 70/		· · · ·	district level ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	86%	YES		Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5 /0	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 184909

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State         State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators         State Target         State Rate         State         <		State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

0%

0.7%

NO

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

15 041901

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

YES

76%

77%

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	63%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	4%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		Targets no	t required for	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	73%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			YES	· · ·	ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	47%	NO		Statement 2	0770	00.170	120		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a						8: Percent of parents with a					Due tr	small

YES

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

**BRONTE ISD** 

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 04190

BRONTE	ISD
--------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	State Target?         Performance Report Indicators         Target         Rate         Target		State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

05 121902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BROOKELAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	53%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 96%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor t required for	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 50%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills         Summary         57%         58.7%		YES		ot reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	/ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_\_

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target? 13: Percent of youth with JEPs aged 16 and above		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<ul> <li>13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs</li> <li>144: Percent of youth who are no longer in</li> </ul>		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

15 025908

**BROOKESMITH ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators t?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	67%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with I through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	96%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	33%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 78%	Reading NO	<b>7B</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 25%	Math NO	acquisition and use of		58.7%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.5 %	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

BROOKESMITH ISD
-----------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 20 County District No 015830 **BROOKS ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND** ENGINEERING

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	95%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 48%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who         Summary Statement 1         81%         82.7%         YES		YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 78	0.0 /0				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 20 County District No 015830 **BROOKS ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND** ENGINEERING

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C. 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

02 024901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BROOKS COUNTY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	92%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc regidential facility	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 48%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who YES		YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.570			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County Di

District

02

Region

BROOKS	COUNTY ISD
--------	------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

LEA 

Region County District No

**BROWNFIELD ISD** 

223901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	80%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	69%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO		
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education	ar early iving the and related	Baseline Data Reporting Year						
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate speducation class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial	Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level		
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	58%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	TES		o small district level		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	51%	NO		Statement 2	5176	50.778	120				
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.378	NO		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of childron with	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv moons of improving services	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES		o small district level		

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

17

data are not reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

\_\_\_

District

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_\_ 22

BROWNFIEL	D ISD
-----------	-------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

107902

**BROWNSBORO ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	81%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **BROWNSBORO ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 10790

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_

031901

District

BROWNSVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	77%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	16%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<i>5C:</i> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who			Baseline Data Repor Targets not required fo			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 53%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 03190

**BROWNSVILLE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

**BROWNWOOD ISD** 

025902

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	94%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 201			0	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	62%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	58%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool	Cummon					
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO	1	YES	children aged 3 through 5 Statemer		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.0 %	NO		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 02590

BROWNWOOD	ISD
-----------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

161919

District	BRUCEVILLE-EDDY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	57%	NO	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	52%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	29%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<i>5C:</i> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 96%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 58%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 51%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.070			123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

BRUCEVILLE-EDDY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 16191

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region06County District No021902

**BRYAN ISD** 

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	65%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	16%	NO	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	24%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 65%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	61%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		·
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 021902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 119901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

BRYSON ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	84%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<i>5C:</i> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 53%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 63%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 %	0.5 /6	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 119901

BRYSON	ISD
--------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

06 166907

BUCKHOLTS ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 71%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 43%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_\_

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 06

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

18 186901

**BUENA VISTA ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate schoof facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UVI		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

Region

**BUENA VISTA ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 14

06 145901

District

BUFFALO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	88%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 2 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	U	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			i ai goto i i			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	51%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /0	00.07	123		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 39%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				3370		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **BUFFALO ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 212902

BULLARD ISD

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES	<ul> <li>5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</li> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		68%	67%	NO	52%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

BUL	LARD	ISD
-----	------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 121903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**BUNA ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 62%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 58%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 121903

BUNA	ISD
------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

09 243901

BURKBURNETT ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	95%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	5%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	U U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 55%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

BURKBURNETT ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		NO
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

05

**BURKEVILLE ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	56%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 94%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece, majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 53%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

BURKEVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_1

11 126902

tor Targets District

BURLESON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Statement 7 Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	72%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%				7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 126902

R	111	RI	ES	ŝ	NI	ISI	n

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

BURNET CISD

027903

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	69%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 48%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 38%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs						demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 02790

BURNET CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region	19
County District No	071801

District BURNHAM WOOD CHARTER SCHOOL DISTRICT

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	U U	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	81%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 68%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No СТ

Region

District	BURNHAM WOOD CHARTER SCHOOL DISTRIC

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 06 County District No 239903

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BURTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	97%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 71%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.5 /6	NO		123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level oot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 239903

BU	IRT	ON	ISD
20		<b>U</b> 14	100

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_\_

16 188904

District

BUSHLAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	U	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	62%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 64%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NU		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invi means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

District

BUSHLAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>16</u>

Region 09 County District No 039901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**BYERS ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	100%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 03990

BYERS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 109902

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

BYNUM ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	73%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 73%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
IEPs						of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 109902

BY	NUM	ISD
----	-----	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

10 116901

District

CADDO MILLS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	95%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	54%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	5%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Statement 7 Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	88%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	163		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 77%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No CADDO MILLS ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	IEP that includes appropriate measurable ondary goals that are annually updated ed upon an age appropriate transition nent, transition services, including courses that will reasonably enable the student to ose postsecondary goals, and annual IEP			YES	
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

02 178903

CALALLEN ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES			
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES			
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES			
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education	lar early iving the and related	Baseline Data Reporting Year							
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.	Targets not required for FFY 2011								
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are not reported				
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 70%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary					district level ot reported			
	83%	59%	NO	73%	NO	nite medge and enine	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small			
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%			demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported					
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	special education services w schools facilitated parent inv	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results		77%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported				

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 17890

CALALLEN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO	YES	
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

06 026901

District

CALDWELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math Math Math Math Math Math Math Children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional Summa	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small							
		Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported							
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 52%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	ar for children with demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to SL	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported						
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 02690

CALDWELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs100%99.3%NO			YES		
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

03 029901

CALHOUN COUNTY ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	91%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	46%	NO		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	18%	NO		
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education	ar early iving the and related	Baseline Data Reporting Year						
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	Targets not required for FFY 2011							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	<b>F7</b> 0/	50.70/	VEO	· · ·	district level ot reported		
	83%	59%	NO	60%	NO		Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES				
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported			

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

CALHOUN COUNTY ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs       100%       99.3%       NO			YES		
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Г

Т

Т

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Т

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

11 049905

District

Т

c	ALLISBUR	G ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with a through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	53%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Report t required for	0	
						residential facility.			[		[	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	58%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary					district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	67%	NO	hitomougo una ohino	Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NU		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_\_

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

 Region
 11

 strict No
 04990

Region County District No

06 198902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CALVERT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	0%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	100%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 - 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 36%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 29%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

CALVERT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 06 198902

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District

\_\_\_\_\_

CALVIN NELMS CHARTER SCHOOLS

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	20%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	60%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6-21, served in separate schools, residentia facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading					e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	9378	3378	123	100 /8	120	education class, separate sc residential facility.	hool or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	TA: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who     Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	83%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /6	00.0 %			o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	75%	NO		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

Region 04 County District No 101837

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 10183

CALVIN NELMS CHARTER SCHOOLS

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

166901

**CAMERON ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	74%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO			1%	1% 1% YES 0%			YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading					e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate s education class, separate sc residential facility.			-			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	58%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 58%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	NO		TES	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

**CAMERON ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 06 16690

Region County District No

10 116910

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CAMPBELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	37%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	NO		TES	ES demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

District

CAMPBELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 10 strict No 116910

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_\_

16 106901

**CANADIAN ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	80%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<ul> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 - 21, served in separate schools, residentia facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</li> <li>6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early</li> </ul>		1% 1% YES 0%			YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who     Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 75%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070	NO		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 10690

CANADIAN ISE
--------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.71%		NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 23

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

CANTON ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 72%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 71%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Summary Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.3%						72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 234902

CANTO	N ISD
-------	-------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

19 071907

District

С	ANUT	ILLO	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	59%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	11%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 63%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 65%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **CANUTILLO ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<ul> <li>13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs</li> </ul>		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary		69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district

education or training program: or competitively

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C. 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 19 071907

level data are not

reported

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

16 191901

District

CANYON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	2%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor ot required fo	U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 69%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 69%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			120			72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 19190

**CANYON ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 07 County District No 201913

District

CARLISLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	19%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	0070	0070		,.		education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district le data are not report	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	00%	00.00/	VEC		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	63%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		not reported
	83%	59%	NO	63%	NO		Statement 2			_		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%			163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 20191

CARL	ISLE	ISD
------	------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annual ate Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

20 064903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

	CARRIZO	SPRINGS	CISD
--	---------	---------	------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	67%	NO	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	76%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	33%	NO	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 62%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 65%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2		57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			.20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Obunty

District

CARRIZO SPRINGS CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 20 County District No 06490

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

11 220919

CARROLL ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	98%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	66%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Targets no	t required fo	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.		79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	92%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	90%	YES	<b>70</b> : Demonstration						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 2209

CARROLL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region 10 County District No

057903

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	80%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	0	
	9378	9970	123	3370	123	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs whoSummary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	70%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /8	00.076	123		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 63%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		0.5%	NG			<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No 05790:

Region

CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH ISI
-------------------------------

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

07 183902

CARTHAGE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			l argets no	t required fo	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs whoSummary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 48%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, o data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 18390

**CARTHAGE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	te State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

220917

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CASTLEBERRY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	54%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 70%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.070			. 20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_\_\_\_\_

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	year of leaving high school         14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary         education or in some other postsecondary employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.		NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 11

State

Target

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

LEA

Rate

CAYUGA ISD

State

Met

Target?

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

Met

State

Target?

State

Met

Target?

LEA

Rate

State

Rate

District

State

Target

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

001902

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math     Math     Math     Math     Math     TA: Percent of preschool       Children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who     with IEPs who     with IEPs who		Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	YES Due to sr numbers, dist					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	data are no	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 70%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to numbers, c	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 65%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are no	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to numbers, c	small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	data are no	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	Due to numbers, o data are no	listrict leve

07

LEA Met

State

Target?

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 001902

CAY	UGA	ISD
-----	-----	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

10 057904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CEDAR HILL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sj	: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 ith IEPs attending (a) regular early hildhood program and receiving the hajority of special education and related ervices in the regular early childhood rogram; and (b) separate special ducation class, separate school or seidential facility				0		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 58%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 057904

CEDAR	HILL	ISD
-------	------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 23

CEDARS INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 50%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· ·	ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

Region

CEDARS INTERNATIONAL ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 116902

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CELESTE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	49%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 61%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 46%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,00	0.070			0	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 116902

CEL	ESTE	ISD
-----	------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 043903

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**CELINA ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	87%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leve data are not reported</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 73%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UVI		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 04390

**CELINA ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 210901

**CENTER ISD** 

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	5%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Targets not required for FFY 2017			FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small
	87%	63%	NO	68%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.5%				<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 21090

C	EN	TE	R IS	SD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

**4B:** Percent of districts that have a

IEPs by race and ethnicity

significant discrepancy in the rate of

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

0%

0.7%

NO

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

State

Region County District No

**CENTER POINT ISD** 

State

20 133901

LEA Met

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

YES

76%

77%

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	67%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	85%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	22%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education	lar early iving the and related		Baseline	e Data Repor	ting Year	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early program; and (b) separate s education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		Targets no	ot required for	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	45%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	45%	NO		Statement 2	0770	00.170	120		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported

YES

8: Percent of parents with a child receiving

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

CENTER P	OINT	SD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

06 145902

**CENTERVILLE ISD** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	86%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	73%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	20%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 32%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 36%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

CENTERVIL	LE ISD
-----------	--------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Г

Т

.

1

Т

Region County District No

06 228904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Т

CENTERVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	68%	67%	NO	88%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	6%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood		Baseline Data R Targets not require			0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	67%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /0	00.076	123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	50%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**CENTERVILLE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 06 County District No 228904

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CENTRAL HEIGHTS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	education class, separate so residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	81%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 89%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level not reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

CENTRAL HEIGHTS ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**CENTRAL ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	86%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			. 20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No \_

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 07

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_

04 101905

District

CHANNELVIEW ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	61%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 vith IEPs attending (a) regular early hildhood program and receiving the najority of special education and related ervices in the regular early childhood rogram; and (b) separate special ducation class, separate school or			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 66%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 64%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.3%			163	S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No	_
CHANNELVIEW ISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

04

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

**CHANNING ISD** 

16 103901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

P													
State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	50%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	89%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	50%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95%	99%	YES	88%	NO	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	120		o small district level	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · · ·	ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	38%	NO		Statement 2	01.70	00.170	120			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.070	No		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 10390

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

11 220815

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CHAPEL HILL ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	U	
						residential facility.			T	I	I	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	67%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	83%	YES	_	Statement 2	5770	56.7 /0	123		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.5%			163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

CHAPEL HILL ACADEMY

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 11

Region County District No

07 212909

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CHAPEL HILL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	82%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	22%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 66%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 62%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	UVI		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

CHAPEL	HILL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

80 225906

CHAPEL HILL ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	70%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	11%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 68%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No CHAPEL HILL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 08 225906

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

20 007901

District

CHARLOTTE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	77%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 94%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	94%	NO	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 53%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	09/	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NU		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

CHARL	OTTE ISD
-------	----------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>20</u>

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

15 206903

CHEROKEE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	94%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs whoSummary Statement 1		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	70%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.070	123		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				00 /0		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 20690

**CHEROKEE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 22

05

CHESTER ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.5 %						72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 229906

CHESTER	R ISD
---------	-------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 11 County District No 249904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CHICO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	95%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 95%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate so education class, separate so	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 70%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool       Summary         children aged 3 through 5       Statement 1         with IEPs who       demonstrate improved use         of appropriate behaviors to       Summary         meet their needs       Statement 2		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs					0			72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

249904

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CHICO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 057811

CHILDREN FIRST ACADEMY OF DALLAS District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	95%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.         7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5         Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due t	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 36%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 39%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 05781

CHILDREN FIRST ACADEMY OF DALLAS

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

16 038901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CHILDRESS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	43%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	13%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 48%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 45%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 03890

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

09 099902

District

CHILLICOTHE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	80%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related convinces in the regular cache whildhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			largets no	ot required to	quired for FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	79%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	00.0%	163		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	57%	NO	70 0	Glatement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NU		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	/ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

CHILLICOTHE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

12 073901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CHILTON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			e Data Repor	0		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 42%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 42%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.576			110	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 07390

CHILTON IS	D
------------	---

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

161920

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CHINA SPRING ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	96%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	46%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	4%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			e Data Repor	0		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	570	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level not reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

**CHINA SPRING ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

District

CHIRENO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc			e Data Repor ot required fo	0		
						residential facility.				T		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	000/	00.00/			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	44%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	44%	NO		Statement 2	0170				
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.3%				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 17490

**CHIRENO ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 139905

CHISUM ISD

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	89%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	73%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	11%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or receidential facility		Baseline Data Reporting Targets not required for FF			0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.       7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who     Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 63%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 139905

CHISUM ISD
------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number	a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number	a are not
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

15 226901

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District

CHRISTOVAL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	83%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	74%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 91%	Reading NO	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Yea Targets not required for FFY 20			0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 40%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 55%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 22690

CHRISTO	VAL ISD
---------	---------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region14County District No067902

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CISCO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood becial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 66%	Reading NO	<b>7B</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.3%			163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 06790

**CISCO ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**CITY CENTER HEALTH CAREERS** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	93%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 33%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 01583

**CITY CENTER HEALTH CAREERS** 

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	a are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	a are not
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No 2

09 243906

District CITY VIE

CITY	VIEW ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	95%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor t required fo	0	
	9370	9970	123	100 %	1123	education class, separate sc residential facility.	hool or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	00%	00.00/	VEO		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	76%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	69%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	001	0.5%	NO		X50	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 243906

CITY	VIEW	ISD
------	------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region County District No

16 065901

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

CLARENDON ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	71%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	89%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	14%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1% 1%		YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				• Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	0070	0070	120	10070	120	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	000/	00.00/			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	81%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	69%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

CLARENDON ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

08 194904

District

CLARKSVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	23%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor t required for	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 33%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 26%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.570			120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **CLARKSVILLE ISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No 00

CLAUDE ISD

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	90%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1% 1%		YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			rargets no	ot required to		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	72%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	52%	NO		Statement 2					
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	in Op/ 0.59/ NO XES with IEPs who 81%	children aged 3 through 5 Statement	children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small			
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NU			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 006902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

04 084910

District

CLEAR CREEK ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	85%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	3%	YES	<ul> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</li> <li>5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 –</li> </ul>		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	#NA	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who     Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 70%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 64%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district leven data are not reported</li> </ul>	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children audo 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.076				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

CLEAR	CREEK	ISD
-------	-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region

significant discrepancy in the rate of

IEPs by race and ethnicity

suspensions and expulsions of greater than

10 days in a school year of children with

0%

0.7%

NO

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

special education services who report that

schools facilitated parent involvement as a

means of improving services and results

for children with disabilities

LEA

Region County District No

**CLEBURNE ISD** 

126903

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual e Performance Report Indicators et?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	70%	NO	<ul> <li>5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</li> <li>5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 -</li> </ul>		68%	67%	NO	76%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	14%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recent majority of special education	lar early iving the and related		Baseline	e Data Repor	ting Year	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.			Targets no	t required fo	r FFY 2011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 65%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	59%	NO		Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 /0	0.5 %				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of						8: Percent of parents with a					Due tr	n emall

YES

11

Due to small

numbers, district level

data are not reported

YES

76%

77%

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 12690

CLEBURNE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 11

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_\_

146901

Obunty District

District

CLEVELAND	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	77%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	51%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	17%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	19%	NO	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc matical admitted (admitted)			e Data Reporting Year ot required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	th Math Facility Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small				
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.570			123	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level not reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 14690

CLEVELAND ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 1 County District No 018

12 018901

District

**CLIFTON ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	85%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	44%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sci residential facility.			•	ata Reporting Year equired for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	52%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 43%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	data are not reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than		0.5%				<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 01890

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 071901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CLINT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	74%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	56%	NO		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	12%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	19%	NO		
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES		
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			Baseline Data Reporting Year argets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due t	o small		
	87%	63%	NO	66%	NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers,	district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 64%	Math NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported		

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 07190

CLI	NT	ISD
-----	----	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No 030902

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CLYDE CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	93%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	80%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	7%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 62%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
IEPs						of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 03090

CLYDE CISE	נ
------------	---

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_1

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

COAHOMA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	80%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	79%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 76%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 56%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 114902

COAHOMA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

06 204901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

COLDSPRING-OAKHURST CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	65%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	15%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		osmall
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 46%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.070			0	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 20490

COLDSPRING-OAKHURST CISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_

15 042901

.

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	70%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 51%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 49%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 04290

COLEMAN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Region County District No

06 021901

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District

COLLEGE STATION ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	55%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not report</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 68%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district data are not report</li> </ul>	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.070			0	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

**COLLEGE STATION ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		NO
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 06 02190

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

10 091902

District

COLLINSVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	88%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 95%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	95%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 68%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 58%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070			125	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No COLLINSVILLE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 10 091902

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

229901

District

COLMESNEIL IS	D
---------------	---

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	88%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool	Summary					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	71%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	53%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.576	NO		113	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No COLMESNEIL ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

05

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

14 168901

District

COLORADO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	63%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	50%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early ving the and related childhood becial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

COLORADO ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

Region County District No

04 020907

LEA Met

District

State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
75%	77%	YES	82%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	80%	YES	
10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES	
100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 97%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Report t required for	0		
Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small	
95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 48%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to numbers, c	o small district level		
Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of				1	data are not reported		

**COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD** 

					_							
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	82%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	80%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	10%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early	ar early iving the and related			e Data Repor	•	
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial		raigets no		1112011	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to numbers, c	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C</b> : Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of						district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	47%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		orreported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to	o small listrict level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		163	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	Due to numbers, c data are no	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No 02090

**COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 04

Region County District No

03 045902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

COLUMBUS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	86%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	5%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	19%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level not reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 52%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 47%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		not reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		not reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level not reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

COL	UMBUS	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et State Performance Plan/ Annual ate Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region13County District No046902

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

COMAL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood				e Data Repor	0	
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	75%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1					o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 69%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00(	0.5%	NO		VEC	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 046902

COMAL	ISD
-------	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

14 047901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

COMANCHE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	57%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	29%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 68%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 66%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs						demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 04790

**COMANCHE ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

13 130902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

COMFORT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ls, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				Data Repor	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary					
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	54%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	<b>F7</b> 0/	F0 70/	VEO	,	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	38%	NO		Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UVI		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 13090

COMFORT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	Met State Performance Plan/ Annual tate Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

10 116903

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

COMMERCE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	58%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 46%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 42%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 78	0.576			115	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 116903

COMMERCE IS
-------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

043918

District

COMMUNITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	65%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				e Data Repor	0	
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool				[		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	69%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00%	00.0%	163		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				0470		7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who         Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

COMMUNITY ISL	MMUNITY ISD
---------------	-------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region <u>10</u>

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No

112908

COMO-PICKTON CISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	60%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO	
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	3%	NO	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 97%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Reporting Year t required for FFY 2011			
						residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	71%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 81%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	data are n	ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported	
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that rolvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No	_
COMO-PICKTON CISD	

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

Region County District No 068802

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

COMPASS ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5with IEPs attending (a) regular earlychildhood program and receiving themajority of special education and relatedservices in the regular early childhoodprogram; and (b) separate specialeducation class, separate school orresidential facility.7A: Percent of preschoolchildren aged 3 through 5with IEPs who				Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small		
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TEO	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		not reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No 068802

Region

COMPASS ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to smal numbers, distr level data are reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

101842

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

COMQUEST	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with <i>l</i> through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day	IEPs aged 6 e regular class	68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility. <b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES Due to		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, o	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 0%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 0%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

COMQUEST ACADEMY

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs       100%       99		99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

04

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

15 233903

District

COMSTOCK ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	74%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	90%	99%	TES	100%	TES	education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	000/	00.00/	×50		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	70%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	70%	NO		Statement 2					
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	00/	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No

COMSTOCK ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CONNALLY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	81%	YES	through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	15%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		YES	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 121, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 98%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /8	80.8 %	1123		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	83%	59%	NO	44%	NO	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 16192

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 170902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CONROE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	?		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	79%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	65%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	5%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	14%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading	Reading 98%	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor	0	
						education class, separate school or residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	0.001	00.00/	¥50		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	78%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	73%	NO		Statement 2	5176	30.778	123		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 170902

CONROE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_1

12 147901

District

COOLIDGE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	te State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators tt? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	50%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	25%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special				e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	95%	99%	YES	97%	YES	education class, separate sc residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	66%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	48%	NO	7C: Percent of preschool						
significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NU		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level oot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

COC	OLIDG	E ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No 06

District	COOPER ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	te State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	15%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· ·	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 49%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 42%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 060902

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_\_

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

COPPELL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	67%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	17%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recen majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 85%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 76%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 drug in a school upper for abildrow with	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs						demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	data are r	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 05792

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

12 050910

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

COPPERAS COVE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	te State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators jet? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	73%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	72%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	12%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.			e Data Repor	Ũ		
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 64%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 60%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

COPPERAS COVE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 05091

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 02

CORPUS CHRISTI ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	et ate performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators get?         5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	70%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	14%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	12%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	<b>6</b> : Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				e Data Repor	U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 56%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0	0.070			. 20	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No	1

Region

CORPUS CHRISTI ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Region County District No 178807

CORPUS CHRISTI MONTESSORI SCHOOL

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	t State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	85%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate si education class, separate sc			Data Repor	0		
						residential facility.			1	1	1	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80 %	80.8 %	1123		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				5778		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 17880

CORPUS CHRISTI MONTESSORI SCHOOL

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

187904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CORRIGAN-CAMDEN ISD	

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	te State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators et? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	71%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	13%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hos, placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 44%	Reading NO	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 41%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.076	NO		120	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	/ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

CORRIGAN-CAMDEN ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 06

Region County District No

12 175903

**Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy** 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CORSICANA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	70%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	62%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	9%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	20%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recent majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate spectructure education class, separate sc residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 57%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 59%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	S with IEPs who demonstrate improved use		82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,00	0.070			0			72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

County District No

District

CORSICANA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56% 57% YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 17590

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) Region12County District No175909

District CORSICANA RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT CENTER

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	0%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		#NA	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	#NA	#NA	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading #NA	Reading #NA	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math #NA	Math #NA	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs       Summary Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070						72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region

District CORSICANA RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT CENTER
---

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

17 095902

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**COTTON CENTER ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>1:</b> Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	80%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	gular early     ceiving the       ceiving the     Baseline Data Reporting Year       on and related     Targets not required for FFY 2011       special     Special					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	74: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to	o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 42%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 42%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	ES demonstrate improved use		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs		0.070			0			72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

Region

095902

COTTON	<b>CENTER ISD</b>
--------	-------------------

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO Due to sn numbers, d level data a reporter		s, district ta are not
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56% 57% YES		YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 142901

20

District

COTULLA ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	71%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	74%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	29%	NO	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	11%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<i>5C:</i> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei- majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.	residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES			61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES	1	
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	57%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	50 %	80.878	1123	Due to small numbers, district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%		NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Percent of preschool Summary ren aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 81% 82.7% YE		YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 14290

COTULLA IS	SD
------------	----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	1% 22% NO numbers level dat		o small s, district ta are not orted	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

State

Target

State

Rate

State Performance Plan/ Annual

Performance Report Indicators

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

Met

State

State

Met

LEA

Rate

Region County District No

13 246914

2011 (2011-12) Dist	rict		COUPLAND	ISD	
State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	68%	67%	NO	91%	YES
<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	10%	13%	NO	0%	YES

Performance Report Indicators	Target	Rate	Target?	Rate	Target?	Performance Report	indicators	Target	Rate	Target?	Rate	Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	91%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosplacements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate so education class; separate so residential facility.	lar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district lev	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved		80%	80.8%	YES	Due to small numbers, district le	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 80%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	09/	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	vho report that volvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 24691

~~			100
- CO	UPL	.AND	ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

**COVINGTON ISD** 

109903

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	55%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosy placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early ( program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor t required fo	0	
	95%	99%	TES	100%	TES	education class, separate sc residential facility.	hool or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district leve	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 65%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved		80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 71%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with 150 ante	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due te	o small
suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	<ul> <li>Bercent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities</li> </ul>		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 10990

COVINGTON ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No \_\_\_\_\_1

10 129901

District

CRANDALL ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	77%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day       68%       67%       NC		NO	74%	YES				
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	9%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ls, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES		
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early ving the and related childhood becial			e Data Repor	0			
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.     Summary Statement 1     79%     81.2%			YES	Due to small				
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) Summary Statement 2 61% 62.1%			YES	numbers, district level data are not reported				
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 70%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 59%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0,0				0	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported		

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 12990

CRANDALL ISC
--------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		NO
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No 05

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District CRANE ISD

LEA State State LEA Met State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators** Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class NO 75% 77% YES 67% 68% 67% NO 80% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 33% 10% 13% NO 8% YES than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO \* 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital 3% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year maiority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved. numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YES skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 66% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 64% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv IEPs of appropriate behaviors to 72% 73.1% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers. district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 05290

CRANE ISD
-----------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

12 018908

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**CRANFILLS GAP ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	78%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 100%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5%	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inve means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

District

018908

CRANFILLS GAP ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_ County District No

12 161901

District

CRAWFORD ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	2%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with a 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			e Data Repor ot required fo	0	
	3370	5570	120	5070	120	education class, separate sc. residential facility.	hool or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	00%	00.00/	VEO		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	85%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	88%	YES		Statement 2	0.70	001170			
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

CR	AWF	ORD	חפו
	AVVE	υκυ	เวบ

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

<u>12</u> 161901

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region 15 County District No 053001

CROCKETT COUNTY CONSOLIDATED CSD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with I through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	87%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	4%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 1 21, served in separate school facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regula childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sci residential facility.	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 60%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 57%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 70	0.070				demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent invo means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

District

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 05300

District CROCKETT COUNTY CONSOLIDATED CSD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

113901

CROCKETT ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	95%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	69%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with 21, served in separate schoo facilities, or homebound/hosp placements	ols, residential	1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 2 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece majority of special education services in the regular early program; and (b) separate sp	ar early iving the and related childhood pecial			Data Repor		
	9370	3378	123	9970	123	education class, separate sc residential facility.	hool or					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved,	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	42%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0070	00.070	120		o small district level
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
14. Dereast of districts that have a	83%	59%	NO	40%	NO	70: Dereent of procedural						
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	UNU		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a special education services w schools facilitated parent inv means of improving services for children with disabilities	ho report that olvement as a	76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

CROCKETT ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 101906 County District No

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District **CROSBY ISD** 

LEA State State LEA Met State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators** Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 85% 68% 67% NO 54% NO 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less NO 10% 11% NO 15% 10% 13% NO 12% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential NO YES 1% 1% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% 21% facilities, or homebound/hospital 3% NO objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year maiority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 99% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved. numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 100% YES skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 62% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 62% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv IEPs of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers. district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 101906

CROSBY ISD
------------

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region County District No

17 054901

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CROSBYTON CISD												
State	State											

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?		
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	90%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<ul> <li>childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</li> <li><b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who</li> </ul>		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related Baseline Data Reporting Year					0	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES									
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math			79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small			
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district level data are not reported			
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES				
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	64%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	0078	00.078	120	Due to numbers. o	small listrict level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 50%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	, -	ot reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	numbers, o data are n	listrict level ot reported		
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small listrict level ot reported		

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No **CROSBYTON CISD** 

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively	71%	69%	69% NO numbers		o small s, district a are not

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

employed or in some other employment within

one year of leaving high school.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

reported

Region County District No

14 030901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CROSS PLAINS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	48%	NO	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school orBaseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 75%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level	
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 83%	Math YES	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0 76	0.5 /0	NO			demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CROSS PLAINS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?			State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No 03090

Region County District No

07 107904

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CROSS	ROADS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	85%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	5%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school orBaseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
			Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES Due to small							
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district leve data are not reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 65%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	S Due to small		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 65%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	076	0.5 /0	NO		115	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	· · · ·	ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No CROSS ROADS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are nor reported	

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region 10790

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

LEA

Region County District No

**CROSSTIMBERS ACADEMY** 

11 184801

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	pecial					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		79%	81.2%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)		61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	7B: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Summary		80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	standards 87% 63% NO 67% NO with IEPs who demonstrate improved		Statement 1	0070	00.073	. 20	Due to small numbers, district leve					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	acquisition and use of		58.7%	YES	,	ot reported

n/ Annual ndicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate

1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	90%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	100%	YES		
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	10%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	0%	YES		
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES		
<b>3B</b> : Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or				Data Repor	0	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES	Due to numbers, c	o small		
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 67%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due to	o small district level		
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 67%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported		
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES	Due to numbers, o	o small		
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	Summary Statement 2	72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported		
<b>4B</b> : Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, c	o small district level ot reported		

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

C

Region County District No 18480

1

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9</b> : Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.24%22%N		NO	numbers	a are not	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

## Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

09 078901

CROWELL ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	93%	YES	
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B</b> : Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES	
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	6 1% YES 0%		0%	YES	
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or			Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
						residential facility.							
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A</b> : Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small	
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district lev data are not reporte</li> </ul>		
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES			
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	63%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported	
	83%	59%	NO	44%	NO		Statement 2						
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who		81%	82.7%	YES		o small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES	S With IEPS who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		district level ot reported	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported	

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 07890

CROWELL IS		CRO	DWE	ELL	ISE
------------	--	-----	-----	-----	-----

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	NO Due to sm numbers, di level data an reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school       56%       57%       YES		YES	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

ng

Region County District No

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

**CROWLEY ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	77%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	60%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	8%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with 21, served inside the regular than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	16%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1% YES 1%		1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 201				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 55%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070			120	S with the switch demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No

Region

CROWLE	EY IS	D
--------	-------	---

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs		99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to sm numbers, di level data ar reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	14B: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school       56%       57%       YES		numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

Region County District No

20 254901

Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CRYSTAL CITY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	68%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	8%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1% 1% YES		2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 20			U U	
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	98%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 41%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 38%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	U 76	0.5%	NO		TES	65 With IEP'S Who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not repor</li> </ul>	
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

County District No CRYSTAL CITY ISD

Region

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.24%22%NO		NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school       56%       57%       YES		number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted		
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 062901 County District No

CUERO ISD

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

LEA State State LEA Met State LEA Met LEA State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Performance Plan/ Annual State State Met Met State **Performance Report Indicators** Performance Report Indicators Target Rate Rate State Target Rate Rate Target? Target? Target? Target? 5A: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma through 21, served inside the regular class YES 75% 77% YES 100% 68% 67% NO 68% YES 80% or more of the day 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out 5B: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 of high school 21, served inside the regular class less 0% YES 10% 11% NO 10% 13% NO 24% NO than 40% of the day 3A: Percent of districts that have a disability 5C: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 subgroup that meets the State's minimum 21, served in separate schools, residential 21% NO \* 1% 1% YES 0% YES "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP 100% facilities, or homebound/hospital objectives for progress for disability placements subgroup 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 3B: Participation rate for children with IEPs with IEPs attending (a) regular early Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading childhood program and receiving the Baseline Data Reporting Year maiority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood Targets not required for FFY 2011 program; and (b) separate special 95% 99% YES 100% YES education class, separate school or residential facility. 7A: Percent of preschool Summarv children aged 3 through 5 79% 81.2% YES Math Math Math Math Math Statement 1 with IEPs who Due to small demonstrate improved. numbers, district level positive social-emotional data are not reported Summarv YES 95% 99% YES 99% YES skills (including social 61% 62.1% Statement 2 relationships) 3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEPs 7B: Percent of preschool Reading Reading Reading Reading Reading children aged 3 through 5 Summarv against grade level, modified, and alternate 80% 80.8% YES Statement 1 with IEPs who achievement standards Due to small 87% 63% NO 44% NO demonstrate improved numbers, district level acquisition and use of Math data are not reported Math Math Math Math knowledge and skills Summary YES 57% 58.7% Statement 2 83% 59% NO 47% NO 4A: Percent of districts that have a 7C: Percent of preschool Summary 82.7% 81% YES significant discrepancy in the rate of children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1 Due to small suspensions and expulsions of greater than with IEPs who 0% NO YES 0.5% numbers, district level 10 days in a school year for children with demonstrate improved use data are not reported Summarv IEPs of appropriate behaviors to 73.1% 72% YES Statement 2 meet their needs 4B: Percent of districts that have a 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving Due to small significant discrepancy in the rate of special education services who report that YES 77% YES suspensions and expulsions of greater than 0% 0.7% NO schools facilitated parent involvement as a 76% numbers. district level 10 days in a school year of children with means of improving services and results data are not reported IEPs by race and ethnicity for children with disabilities

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 06290

CU	ERO	ISD
		100

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher 24% 22% NO		number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school       56%       57%       YE		YES	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) District County District No

Region

CULBERSON COUNTY-ALLAMOORE ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with through 21, served inside the 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	81%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES				13%	NO	9%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	% 1% YES 3%		3%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	<b>6:</b> Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending (a) regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or		Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011				
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	residential facility.       7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who   Summary Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES	Due t	o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not repor</li> </ul>	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 59%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 53%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	<ul> <li>numbers, district le data are not repor</li> </ul>	
4A: Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 Statement 1		81%	82.7%	YES	Due to small	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	078	0.076	NO			S demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level lot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No 05590

CULBERSON COUNTY-ALLAMOORE ISD

District

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

07 212801

District

CUMBERLAND ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	#NA	#NA	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	64%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	#NA	#NA	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	3%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and rece. majority of special education services in the regular early	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	95% 99% YES 100% YES program; and (b) separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.											
	Math Math Math Math Math Math The second statement of	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small					
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	numbers, district lev data are not reporte	
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	72%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	00 /8	00.078	120		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 76%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than						YES <b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use		81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		TES			72%	73.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

District

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_ County District No

CUMBERLAND ACADEMY

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

Region 08 County District No 112905

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

CUMBY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	82%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	6%	YES
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	0%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
						residential facility.						
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved.	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small district level
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5	Summary	80%	80.8%	YES		
achievement standards	87%	63%	NO	68%	NO	with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Statement 1	80%	80.8%	TES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 54%	Math NO	acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES	· · ·	ot reported
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than				54%		<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	· · ·	district level ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 112905

CUMBY ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	number level dat	o small s, district ta are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region \_\_\_\_\_\_ County District No 1

07 174902

District

CUSHING ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	100%	YES	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	78%	YES
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	0%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	7%	YES
3A: Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		*	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	2%	NO
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 100%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	7A: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who Statement 1		79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	100%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES		district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES	Due tr	o small
	87% Math	63% Math	NO Math	62% Math	NO Math	demonstrate improved acquisition and use of					numbers, o	district level ot reported
	83%	59%	NO	62%	NO	knowledge and skills	Summary Statement 2	57%	58.7%	YES		errepented
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	<b>7C:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	81%	82.7%	YES		o small district level
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	0%	0.3%	UNU		160	demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs Summary Statement 2		72%	73.1%	YES	,	ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers, o	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

District

Region County District No 17490

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>11</b> : Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		YES	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		YES	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this District Profile, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Areas which are graved out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B. 9. 10. 11. and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against Note: the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.

# Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy 2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets

Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12)

Region County District No

101907

District

**CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS ISD** 

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Pla Performance Report I		State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	75%	77%	YES	70%	NO	<b>5A:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21, served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day		68%	67%	NO	66%	NO
2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	10%	11%	NO	6%	YES	<b>5B:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day		10%	13%	NO	16%	NO
<b>3A</b> : Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size (50) that meet the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup	100%	21%	NO		NO	<b>5C:</b> Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 – 21, served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements		1%	1%	YES	1%	YES
<b>3B:</b> Participation rate for children with IEPs	Reading 95%	Reading 99%	Reading YES	Reading 99%	Reading YES	6: Percent of children aged 3 with IEPs attending (a) regul childhood program and recei majority of special education services in the regular early of program; and (b) separate sp education class, separate sc residential facility.	Baseline Data Reporting Year Targets not required for FFY 2011					
	Math	Math	Math	Math	Math	<b>7A:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who	Summary Statement 1	79%	81.2%	YES		o small
	95%	99%	YES	99%	YES	demonstrate improved, positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)	Summary Statement 2	61%	62.1%	YES	,	district level ot reported
<b>3C:</b> Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate achievement standards	Reading 87%	Reading 63%	Reading NO	Reading 78%	Reading NO	<b>7B:</b> Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved	Summary Statement 1	80%	80.8%	YES		o small district level
	Math 83%	Math 59%	Math NO	Math 76%	Math NO	th acquisition and use of knowledge and skills Statement 2 57%		58.7%	YES		ot reported	
<b>4A:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than	0%	0.5%	NO		YES	YES     7C: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs     Summary Statement 1     81%		82.7%	YES		o small district level	
10 days in a school year for children with IEPs	070	0.070						72%	73.1%	YES		ot reported
<b>4B:</b> Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs by race and ethnicity	0%	0.7%	NO		YES	8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities		76%	77%	YES	numbers,	o small district level ot reported

#### Texas Education Agency | Federal and State Education Policy

2013 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Profile

District

of Performance on State Performance Plan Indicator Targets Federal Fiscal Year 2011 (2011-12) County District No

Region

CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS ISD

State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?	State Performance Plan/ Annual Performance Report Indicators	State Target	State Rate	State Met Target?	LEA Rate	LEA Met State Target?
<b>9:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>13</b> : Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs	100%	99.3%	NO		YES
<b>10:</b> Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	0%	0%	YES		YES	<b>14A:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	24%	22%	NO	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe	100%	98.8%	NO		NO	<b>14B</b> : Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	56%	57%	YES	Due to small numbers, district level data are not reported	
<b>12:</b> Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	100%	99.1%	NO		NO	<b>14B:</b> Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	71%	69%	NO	numbers level dat	o small s, district a are not orted

#### About the 2013 District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators Report

In accordance with IDEA 2004 statute, Section 616(b)(2)(C)(i)(II), states are required to publicly report district performance against the state targets in the State Performance Plan (SPP). Each spring, the Texas Education Agency produces a *District Profile of State Performance Plan Indicators* Report for each district in the state. This report reflects the district's performance against the state target for SPP Indicators 1-14 for a given year. The TEA draws on a variety of data sources to compile this *District Profile*, including information from Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) for Indicators 1, 2, 4A-B, 5A-C, 6, 9 and 10; the assessment data for Indicators 3A-C, annual survey results for Indicators 8 and 14A-C; and state data collection systems for Indicators 7A-C, 11, 12, and 13.

The state targets for Indicators 2, 3A, 4A, 5A-C, 6, 7A-C, 8, and 14A-C are set by the Texas Education Agency with advisement from the Texas Steering Committee. The state targets for indicators 1, 3B-C reflect established No Child Left Behind (NCLB) targets from the state's Accountability Workbook. The state targets for Indicators 4B, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are compliance in nature and set by the US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs at either 0% noncompliance identified (Indicators 4B, 9 and 10) or 100% compliance identified (Indicators 11, 12, and 13). The methodologies for each of these indicators for the given year are available on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/special.ed/.

Note: Areas which are grayed out under the "LEA Rate" column for Indicators 4A-B, 9, 10, 11, and 12 reflect that specific LEA data are not reported, only the status of LEA performance against the state target. Due to small numbers for Indicator 7A-C, 8, and 14, district level data are not publicly reported. Districts that did not meet the minimum N size (50) for reporting Indicator 3A are designated with the \* symbol in the "LEA Met State Target?" column. Districts that were not analyzed due to data availability are designated with #N/A.